



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/988,333

11/19/2001

Yuichi Narita

110982

8553

25944

7590

05/01/2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC

P.O. BOX 320850

ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850

EXAMINER

LAstra, DANIEL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3688

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/01/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/988,333	Applicant(s) NARITA ET AL.	
	Examiner DANIEL LASTRA	Art Unit 3688	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 February 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-38 have been examined. Application 09/988,333 (AWARD POINT SERVICE SYSTEM, RECORDING MEDIUM FOR USE THEREIN AND AWARD POINT SERVICE METHOD) has a filing date 11/19/2001 and foreign priority 11/20/2000.

Response to Amendment

2. In response to Non Final Rejection filed 11/09/2007, the Applicant filed an Amendment on 02/11/2008, which amended claims 1, 19, 27, 29, 30 and added new claims 37-38.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Said claims recite first memory that only stores data of points issued to customer in at least one virtual store on the network and a second memory that only stores data of the points issued to the customer in at least one actual store". The Applicant's specification does not explain how the system is able to

Art Unit: 3688

distinguish between points that come from a virtual store from points that come from an actual store and to differentiate between memories.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 1, 19 and 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1 and 19 recite "first memory that only stores data of points issued to customer in at least one virtual store on the network and a second memory that only stores data of the points issued to the customer in at least one actual store". For purpose of art rejection, said limitation would be interpreted as storing points in a network server and in smart card memory. Claims 1 and 19 recite "the first memory and the second memory are associated with the same company". For purpose of art rejection, said limitation would be interpreted as meaning as storing points in a first and second memories where said points are related to a same issuer's company. Claim 37 is indefinite because it is not clear the meaning of "controls the points issued by the point issuing device and the points reduced by the point reducing device to ensure that the operation costs of the award point service system born by each of the at least one actual store and at least one virtual store are proportional to the use made of the award point service system by the store". For purpose of art rejection, said claim 37 would be interpreted as meaning that points would be issued and redeemed based upon the sponsor issuer budget limitation.

Claim 37 recites the limitation "the managing device". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Postrel (US 6,594,640) in view of Taylor (US 5,578,808).

Claim 1, Postrel teaches:

An award point service system, comprising:

a network comprising:

a point issuing device that issues points to a customer who purchases an article (see col 9, lines 55-65);

a first memory that only stores data of the points issued to the customer (see col 9, lines 55-65) in at least one virtual store on the network (see col 4, lines 5-40);

wherein the at least one virtual store established on the network is accessible to the point issuing device (see figure 4); and wherein the at least one actual store is accessible to the point reducing device (see col 9, lines 55-65 "vender associated with a computer connected to the Internet"). Postrel fails to teach a second memory that only

Art Unit: 3688

stores data of the points issued to the customer in at least one actual store; a data access permitting device that permits the data of the points issued to the customer to be read from the first and second memories; and a point reducing device that allows use of at least a part of the points read from the first and second memories by subtracting the at least part of the points from the data of the points stored in the first and second memories. However, Taylor teaches a smart card that stores point information from a plurality of vendors in different memories areas linked to said vendors and where said points are used as payment for purchases (see col 3, lines 20-40; col 7, lines 35-50). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the application was made, to know that Postrel's smart card would have a plurality of memories which would store point information from a plurality of vendors, as taught by Taylor in order to link awarded points with the issuing vendor of said awarded points and use said awarded points from different vendors as payment for purchases.

wherein the first memory and the second memory are associated with a same company (see Postrel "Airline Reward server" and airline miles would be added to a smart card"; col 9, lines 55-65)

Claim 2, Postrel teaches:

wherein the at least one actual store is accessible to the point issuing device (see col 9, lines 55-65).

Claim 3, Postrel teaches:

wherein the at least one virtual store is accessible to the point reducing device (see col 4, lines 4-45).

Claim 4, Postrel teaches:

wherein the at least one virtual store is accessible to the point reducing device (see col 4, lines 4-45).

Claim 5, Postrel teaches:

A managing device that manages the points issued by the point issuing device and the points reduced by the point reducing device (see col 4, lines 5-45).

Claim 6, Postrel teaches:

a managing device that manages the points issued by the point issuing device and the points reduced by the point reducing device (see col 4, lines 5-45).

Claim 7, Postrel teaches:

a managing device that manages the points issued by the point issuing device and the points reduced by the point reducing device (see col 4, lines 5-45).

Claim 8, Postrel teaches:

a managing device that manages the points issued by the point issuing device and the points reduced by the point reducing device (see col 4, lines 5-45).

Claim 9, Postrel teaches:

wherein the data access permitting device comprises a terminal provided in the actual store (see col 9, lines 55-65), and the terminal receives the data of the points from a recording medium owned by the customer and supplies the recording medium with the data of the points (see col 9, lines 55-65).

Claim 10, Postrel teaches:

wherein the data access permitting device comprises a terminal provided in the actual store, and the terminal receives the data of the points from a recording medium owned by the customer and supplies the recording medium with the data of the points (see col 9, lines 55-67).

Claim 11, Postrel teaches:

wherein the data access permitting device comprises a terminal provided in the actual store, and the terminal receives the data of the points from a recording medium owned by the customer and supplies the recording medium with the data of the points (see col 9, lines 55-67).

Claim 12, Postrel teaches:

wherein the data access permitting device comprises a terminal provided in the actual store, and the terminal receives the data of the points from a recording medium owned by the customer and supplies the recording medium with the data of the points (see col 9, lines 55-67).

Claim 13, Postrel teaches:

wherein the data access permitting device comprises a terminal provided in the actual store, and the terminal receives the data of the points from a recording medium owned by the customer and supplies the recording medium with the data of the points (see col 9, lines 55-67).

Claim 14, Postrel teaches:

wherein the recording medium comprises a medium used for making a payment (see col 9, lines 55-65).

Claim 15, Postrel teaches:

wherein the terminal is a point of sale (POS) terminal (see col 10, lines 1-10).

As per claim 16, Postrel teaches:

wherein the terminal is a credit authorization terminal (CAT) (see col 10, lines 1-10).

As per claim 17, Postrel teaches:

a credit company that issues credit to the customer comprising:

a first credit company memory for storing data of the points issued to the customer in virtual stores (see col 5, lines 45-55; "credit card server capable of holding a user's earned rewards");

a credit company virtual server connected to the first credit company memory that is configured to communicate with the at least one virtual store (see figure 4, item 12); and

Postrel fails to teach a second credit company memory for storing data of the points issued to the customer in an actual store;

a credit company actual server connected to the second credit company memory that is configured to communicate with the at least one actual store,

wherein the customer can purchase items from the at least one virtual store and the at least one actual store with credit (see col 10, lines 1-15).

However, Taylor teaches a smart card that stores point information obtained from a plurality of actual vendors obtained from purchases made using a credit card (see col 6, lines 1-10). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the

Art Unit: 3688

art at the time the application was made, to know that Postrel's credit card server would have a plurality of memories which would store point information from a plurality of credit card issuers, being said points obtained from actual or virtual stores, as taught by Taylor in order to link awarded points with the issuing vendor of said awarded points and use said awarded points from different vendors as payment for purchases.

Claim 18, Postrel teaches:

an information processing center communicatively connected to the credit company actual server and credit company virtual server that processes purchases made under credit by the customer wherein the credit company actual server communicates with the at least one actual store via the information processing center (see col 10, lines 1-10).

Claim 19, Postrel teaches:

An award point service system, comprising:

a network comprising:

a point issuing device that issues points to a customer who purchases an article (see col 9, lines 55-65);

a first memory that only stores data of the points issued to the customer (see col 9, lines 55-65) in at least one virtual store (see col 9, lines 55-65);

a data access permitting device that permits the data of the points issued to the customer to be read from the memory (see col 9, lines 55-65), and

a point reducing device that allows use of at least a part of the points read from the memory by subtracting the at least part of the points from the data of the points

Art Unit: 3688

stored in the memory (see col 9, lines 55-65); wherein the at least one virtual store established on the network is accessible to the point reducing device (see col 4, lines 1-45); and wherein the at least one actual store is accessible to the point issuing device (see col 9, lines 55-65). Postrel fails to teach a second memory that only stores data of the points issued to the customer in at least one actual store. However, Taylor teaches a smart card that stores point information from a plurality of vendors in different memories areas linked to said vendors and where said points are used as payment for purchases (see col 3, lines 20-40; col 7, lines 35-50). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the application was made, to know that Postrel's smart card would have a plurality of memories which would store point information from a plurality of vendors, as taught by Taylor in order to link awarded points with the issuing vendor of said awarded points and use said awarded points from different vendors as payment for purchases.

wherein the first memory and the second memory are associated with a same company (see Postrel "Airline Reward server" see figure 4; see Taylor figure 1 "airlines").

Claim 20, Postrel teaches:

wherein the at least one virtual store is accessible to the point issuing device (see col 4, lines 1-45).

Claim 21, Postrel teaches:

wherein the at least one actual store is accessible to the point reducing device (see col 9, lines 55-65).

Claim 22, Postrel teaches:

a credit company that issues credit to the customer comprising:

a first credit company memory for storing data of the points issued to the customer in virtual stores (see col 5, lines 45-55; "credit card server capable of holding a user's earned rewards");

a credit company virtual server connected to the first credit company memory that is configured to communicate with the at least one virtual store (see figure 4, item 12 and 30); and

Postrel fails to teach a second credit company memory for storing data of the points issued to the customer in an actual store;

a credit company actual server connected to the second credit company memory that is configured to communicate with the at least one actual store,

wherein the customer can purchase items from the at least one virtual store and the at least one actual store with credit.

However, Taylor teaches a smart card that stores point information from a plurality of vendors in different memories areas linked to said vendors and where said points are used as payment for purchases (see col 3, lines 20-40; col 7, lines 35-50). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the application was made, to know that Postrel's credit card server would have a plurality of memories which would store point information from a plurality of vendors, being said vendors actual or virtual stores as taught by Taylor in order to link awarded

Art Unit: 3688

points with the issuing vendor of said awarded points and use said awarded points from different vendors as payment for purchases.

Claim 23, Postrel teaches:

wherein the data access permitting device comprises a terminal provided in one of the at least one actual store, and the terminal receives the data of the points from a recording medium owned by the customer and supplies the recording medium with the data of the points (see col 9, lines 55-65).

Claim 24, Postrel teaches:

wherein the data access permitting device comprises a terminal provided in one of the at least one actual store, and the terminal receives the data of the points from a recording medium owned by the customer and supplies the recording medium with the data of the points (see col 9, lines 55-65).

Claim 25, Postrel teaches:

wherein the data access permitting device comprises a terminal provided in one of the at least one actual store, and the terminal receives the data of the points from a recording medium owned by the customer and supplies the recording medium with the data of the points (see col 9, lines 55-65).

Claim 26, Postrel teaches:

wherein the recording medium comprises a medium used for making a payment (see col 9, lines 55-65).

Claim 27, Postrel teaches:

A computer-readable recording medium used in a point service system including a network comprising an award point issuing device that issues points to a customer who purchases an article, a first memory that only stores data of the points issued to the customer (see col 9, lines 55-65) from at least one virtual store, and wherein the recording medium stores the points issued or reduced by any of the at least one virtual store and the at least one actual store (see col 9, lines 55-65). Postrel fails to teach a second memory that only stores data of the points issued to the customer from at least one actual store, a tie-up company comprising the first and second memories, a data access permitting device that permits the data of the points issued to the customer to be read from the first and second memories and a point reducing device that allows use of at least a part of the points read from the first and second memories by subtracting the at least part of the points from the data of the points stored in the first and second memories, the recording medium comprising: a first working file that stores points and a second working files that stores information identifying the tie-up company, wherein the recording medium transmits and receives the data of the points to and from the first and second memories via the data access permitting device. However, Taylor teaches a smart card that stores point information from a plurality of vendors in different memories areas linked to said vendors and where said points are used as payment for purchases (see col 3, lines 20-40; col 7, lines 35-50). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the application was made, to know that Postrel's smart card would have a plurality of memories which would store point information from a plurality of vendors, as taught by Taylor in order to link awarded

points with the issuing vendor of said awarded points and use said awarded points from different vendors as payment for purchases.

Claim 28, Postrel teaches:

comprising an IC card having an IC chip (see col 9, lines 55-65).

Claim 29, Postrel teaches:

An award point service management method for use with an award point service system comprising the steps of issuing points to a customer who purchases an article in at least one of virtual stores established on a network;

recording the issued points in the first memory (see col 9, lines 55-65); and

subtracting points used by the customer in at least one of a actual stores from the data of the points stored in the first memory such that the points are used by the customer for purchasing an article in the at least one of actual stores (see col 9, lines 55-65).

Postrel fails to teach a network comprising a tie-up company having a first memory that only stores points relating to purchases made by the customer in at least one of virtual stores and a second memory that only stores points relating to purchases made by the customer in at least one actual store, the tie-up company managing points issued to users from a plurality of stores. However, Taylor teaches a smart card that stores point information from a plurality of vendors in different memories areas linked to said vendors and where said points are used as payment for purchases (see col 3, lines 20-40; col 7, lines 35-50). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the application was made, to know that Postrel's smart card

Art Unit: 3688

would have a plurality of memories which would store point information from a plurality of vendors, as taught by Taylor in order to link awarded points with the issuing vendor of said awarded points and use said awarded points from different vendors as payment for purchases.

Claim 30, Postrel teaches:

An award point service management method for use with an award point service system comprising the steps of:

issuing points to a customer who purchases an article in at least one of actual stores (see col 9, lines 55-65);

recording the issued points in the second memory (see col 9, lines 55-65);

Postrel fails to teach having a network comprising a tie-up company having a first memory that only stores points relating to purchases made by the customer in at least one virtual store and a second memory that only stores points relating to purchases made by the customer in at least one actual store, the tie-up company managing points issued to users from a plurality of stores and transferring at least a portion of the points in the second memory to the first memory and subtracting points used by the customer in at least one of virtual stores from the data of the points stored in the first memory such that the points are used by the customer for purchasing an article in the at least one of virtual stores. However, Taylor teaches a smart card that stores point information from a plurality of vendors in different memories areas linked to said vendors and where said points are used as payment for purchases (see col 3, lines 20-40; col 7, lines 35-50). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the

Art Unit: 3688

time the application was made, to know that Postrel's smart card would have a plurality of memories which would store point information from a plurality of vendors, as taught by Taylor in order to link awarded points with the issuing vendor of said awarded points and use said awarded points from different vendors as payment for purchases.

Claims 31 and 34, Postrel fails to teach:

wherein the first memory stores points issued by two or more virtual stores and the second memory stores points issued by two or more actual stores. However, Taylor teaches a smart card that stores points issued from stores that accepts visa, American-express cards (see figure 1). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the application was made, to know that Postrel's smart card would use the Taylor system to stores points from a plurality of virtual or actual stores in the memory of said card.

Claims 32 and 35, Postrel fails to teach:

wherein all of the points issued by virtual stores are stored in the first memory and all of the points issued by actual stores are stored in the second memory. However, Taylor teaches a smart card that stores points from different vendors in said smart card memory and where each vendor has each own section in said smart card (see figure 1). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the application was made, to know that Postrel's smart card would use the Taylor system to stores points from a plurality of virtual or actual stores in a memory of said card in order to differentiate between different vendors that provided with said points.

Claims 33 and 36, Postrel fails to teach:

at least one tie-up company comprising the first and second memories. However, Taylor teaches a smart card where a single company (i.e. visa) can occupy different memories to stores different points in said card (see figure 4, "visa debit and credit"). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the application was made, to know that Postrel would use the Taylor system to stores points from a plurality of virtual or actual stores in a memory of a smart card in order to differentiate the source of said earned points.

Claim 37, Postrel does not expressly teach:

wherein the managing device comprises:

a switching server connected to the network which controls the points issued by the point issuing device and the points reduced by the point reducing device to ensure that the operation costs of the award point service system born by each of the at least one actual store and at least one virtual store are proportional to the use made of the award point service system by the store. However, Official Notice is taken that it is old and well known in the promotion art that points cost money and points would be issued and redeemed based upon the sponsor issuer budget. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the application was made, to know that Postrel would control the redemption and issuing of points as points cost money to issuers.

Claim 38, Postrel does not teach:

a credit company registration device that enables the customer to apply to a credit card company to obtain a credit card as part of registering to join the award point

service system, the credit registration device providing the customer with acceptance by the credit card company during the registration process when the customer is qualified by the credit card company. However, Official Notice is taken that it is old and well known in the promotion art to register to obtain credit cards and to be qualified for said obtaining. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the application was made, to know that users of Postrel's credit card linked to points accounts would need to register for said credit cards, as it is old and well known to register and being qualified for a credit card.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 02/11/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The Applicant argues that Postrel fails to teach a first memory that only stores data of points issued to the customer in at least one virtual store on the network and a second memory that only stores data of points issued to the customer in at least one actual store. The Examiner answers that Postrel teaches storing points issued by the customer from a virtual store (see Figure 4 "airline server") and Taylor teaches storing points issued to a customer from actual stores (see col 3, lines 25-40). Therefore, contrary to Applicant's argument, Postrel and Taylor teach Applicant's claimed limitation.

The Applicant argues that Taylor only discloses only one account record per company and they are not account, according to the Applicant, separated according to whether the points are awarded from a virtual store or an actual store. The Examiner answers that he did a 103 rejection, to teach virtual store using Postrel and the actual

store from Taylor. Therefore, contrary to Applicant's argument, Postrel and Taylor teach Applicant's claimed invention.

The Applicant argues that Postrel fails to disclose a first memory that only stores data of the points issued to the customer from at least one virtual store and a second memory that only stores data of the points issued to the customer from at least one actual store. The Examiner answers that Postrel teaches storing points in a network server (see figure 4) and in a smart card (see col 9, lines 55-67). Therefore, contrary to Applicant's argument, Postrel teaches Applicant's claimed limitation.

The Applicant argues that Postrel fails to teach an Information processing center because according to the Applicant, there is no indication in Postrel that an information processing center is part of the linked of the card to the user's account and is no inherent in such as a link, according to the Applicant, as Postrel's system is not using the credit card infrastructure to access a credit card server but is used to access the user's point account. The Examiner answers that Postrel teaches using the existing credit card payment infrastructure (i.e. "information processing center") in order to permit the payment for purchase with a merchant. Therefore, contrary to Applicant's argument, Postrel teaches Applicant's claimed limitation.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DANIEL LASTRA whose telephone number is 571-272-6720 and fax 571-273-6720. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00.

Art Unit: 3688

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, ERIC W. STAMBER can be reached on 571-272-6724. The official Fax number is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/DANIEL LASTRA/
Art Unit 3688
April 27,2008